UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,871	03/12/2004	David A. Pintsov	11JN-123385	6131

30764   7590   10/15/2007
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
333 SOUTH HOPE STREET
48TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-1448

EXAMINER
RASHID, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/799,871	PINTSOV ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David P. Rashid	2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _David P. Rashid (examiner)_.

(3)_David Heisey (Reg. No. 42,651)_ .

(2) _Vikkram Bali (primary examiner)_.

(4)_____ .

Date of Interview: _11 October 2007_.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
      c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
    If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: _1, 8, 10, 15, 16, and 21_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Stolfo (US 5,668,897 A)_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☒ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _Applicant's representative discussed the issues outlined in Attachment A. A response with the arguments will follow_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

VIKKRAM BALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Examiner's signature, if required

Topics for Discussion for Telephonic Interview on 10-11-2007

1. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

    A.   Paragraph 4 of the Action rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stolfo.

    B.   Independent claim 1 recites, "[a] method of automatically selecting document templates, comprising the steps of:

        presenting a document image from an account;

        matching the document image against a series of known document templates from the account, each document template including information about a unique layout of a particular document to allow that particular document to be <u>identified</u> and information from that particular document to be <u>identified and read</u>; and

        producing confidence scores corresponding to the degree of similarity of the document image compared to each document template."

        i.   Independent claim 10 is similar to claim 1, but instead recites a "check template", which is one type of document template, and claim 16 recites a "document template"

    C.   Stolfo does not teach that each record contains information about a unique layout to allow the document itself to be identified and information in that particular document to be identified and read.

        i.   "The pattern recognition algorithms, for extracting a background pattern from the check, preferably use a tuned <u>filter</u> (e.g. a spatial image processing filter which is selective for a pattern or class of patterns), for the similar characteristics of the background such as image and colors 102." Col. 22, lines 58-65.

        ii.   This filtering is not "identifying" the document and "reading" information in the document, per claims 1, 10 and 16.

        iii.   "[0040] One embodiment of the present invention creates a template of each document 300 that may be processed in the automated system. The <u>template includes information about the unique layout of document 300 that allows the system to identify and read the document 300</u>. The system can then search the document for <u>distinctive features</u> such as the logo 305 or graphic 325, or a particular pattern of horizontal or vertical lines. After these distinctive features are identified, the document 300 is matched with the appropriate template. The <u>template is then used to identify the location</u> on the document to look for the information that is desired during processing. Once the location of the information is known, the information may be read automatically using optical character recognition (OCR) or any other technique known in the art. The template system may even compensate for distortions in the document due to feeding errors, or other sources of image distortions."

    D.   The "collection of identifiers" in the Stolfo records only distinguishes the records from each other (Id.), and has no role in identifying a particular document or allowing information in a particular document to be identified and read.

    E.   Although Stolfo teaches that information, such as a signature from a document/check, may be identified (see, e.g., column 26, lines 57-66; column 27-5), the records of Stolfo themselves do not include information about a unique layout to allow information in a particular document to be identified and read, as would be required by

claims 1, 10, and 16. Rather, Stolfo teaches that the information is obtained from the remainder after the records are used to subtract the document background away. (Id.)

F.   Claims 8, 15, and 21 are further distinguishable from Stolfo.

i.   Claims recite the creation of one or more "exclusion zones" corresponding to image parts that exhibit a low confidence score. The Examiner interprets an exclusion zone as any action taken if the image part of the check does not match with a pre-established threshold. The present invention's description of exclusion zone, however, is different. After the outcome of a partial layout comparison, if a there is a relatively small zone of low-confidence matching, that zone will be labeled as an exclusion zone. (See, e.g., paragraph [0061]) This exclusion zone will be excluded from future image feature comparisons. (Id.) Consequently, Stolfo fails to teach the creation of one or more exclusion zones corresponding to image parts that exhibit a low confidence score.

ii.   A confidence score is not "yes/100%" or "no/0%. I understand taking a broad reading of the prior art, but this is stretching things too far. These are not confidence scores and there is no indication that they are 100% accurate or confident in the scores.